

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,857	07/30/2003	Yasunori Nakamura	030918	6154
23850 7590 08/23/2007 KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP			EXAMINER	
1420 K Street, N.W. Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/629,857	NAKAMURA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		William K. Cheung	1713			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SH WHIC - External afternal	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 M	ay 2007.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)□	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1 and 7</u> is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1 and 7</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r. '				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ a)i	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attach	*/c)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

- 1. The request filed on May 29, 2007 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 10/629857 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
- 2. In view of the amendment filed May 29, 2007, claim 3 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 7 are pending.
- 3. In view of the cancellation of claim 3, the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chatterjee (US 5,922,471), is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/629,857

Art Unit: 1713

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. Claims 1, 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chatterjee (US 5,922,471) for the reasons adequately set forth from paragraph 4 of final office action issued November 29, 2006.

Applicant's arguments filed May 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Chattergee is silent on a composition comprising a phenol- and/or phosphorus-based antioxidant having a molecular weight of 500 or more. However, applicants fail to recognize that Chattergee (col. 2, line 54 to col. 3, line 17) clearly disclose phenol-based and phosphorous based antioxidant having a molecular weight of 500 or more. Regarding the argued improved stiffness and heat sealing property, the features are not in the claims.

Art Unit: 1713

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William K. Cheung, Ph. D.

Primary Examiner

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 18, 2007